Putting the ecology back into insect cognition research

Mathieu Lihoreau, Thibaud Dubois, Tamara Gomez-Moracho, Stéphane Kraus, Coline Monchanin, Cristian Pasquaretta

► To cite this version:

Mathieu Lihoreau, Thibaud Dubois, Tamara Gomez-Moracho, Stéphane Kraus, Coline Monchanin, et al.. Putting the ecology back into insect cognition research. *Advances in insect physiology*, In press, 57, pp.1 - 25. 10.1016/bs.aiip.2019.08.002 . hal-02324976

HAL Id: hal-02324976

<https://hal.science/hal-02324976>

Submitted on 4 Jan 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Ecology and evolution of insect cognition

Putting the ecology back into insect cognition research

Mathieu Lihoreau^{1†}, Thibault Dubois^{1,2*}, Tamara Gomez-Moracho^{1*}, Stéphane Kraus^{1*},
Celine Monchanin^{1,2*}, Cristian Pasquaretta^{1*}

¹Research Center on Animal Cognition (CRCA), Center for Integrative Biology (CBI);
CNRS, University Paul Sabatier, Toulouse, France

²Department of Biological Sciences, Macquarie University, NSW, Australia

* These authors contributed equally to the work

[†]Corresponding author: mathieu.lihoreau@univ-tlse3.fr

Abstract

Over the past decades, research on insect cognition has made considerable advances in describing the ability of model species (in particular bees and fruit flies) to achieve cognitive tasks once thought to be unique to vertebrates, and investigating how these may be implemented in a miniature brain. While this lab-based research is critical to understand some fundamental mechanisms of insect brains and cognition, taking a more integrative and comparative view will help us making sense of this rich behavioural repertoire and its evolution. Here we argue that there is a need to reconsider insect cognition into an ecological context, in order to design experiments that address the cognitive challenges insects face in nature, identify competing hypotheses about the cognitive abilities driving the observed behavioural responses, and test them across different populations and species. Reconnecting with the tradition of naturalistic observations, by testing animals in the field or in ecologically-inspired setup and comparing the performances of individuals, is complementary to mechanistic research in the lab, and will greatly improve our understanding of the role of insect cognition, its diversity, and the influence of ecological factors in its evolution.

Key words: insects, cognition, brain, behaviour, learning, memory, natural selection, sociality, field-based research, cognitive ecology

36 “... *que se passe-t-il dans ce petit cerveau d’hyménoptère? Y a-t-il là des facultés soeurs des*
37 *nôtres, y a-t-il une pensée? Quel problème, si nous pouvions le résoudre; quel chapitre de*
38 *psychologie, si nous pouvions l’écrire!*” [... *what happens in this little brain of*
39 *Hymenoptera? Are there abilities similar to ours, is there a thought? What problem, if we*
40 *could solve it; what chapter of psychology, if we could write it!*]

41 Translated from Jean-Henri Fabre (Fabre, 1882, p405).

43 **1. Past and present of insect cognition research**

44 Famous naturalists such as Réaumur, De Geer, Latreille, Fabre, Darwin, Lubbock, to name
45 just a few, have played a considerable role in suggesting that insects, just like large-brained
46 animals, are capable of adapting to new situations through various forms of learning, memory
47 and information transfer. In the 20th century, the first ethologists made invaluable
48 contributions to our understanding of these processes, through experimental manipulations
49 and quantifications of insect behaviour in the field. Von Frisch (1915), for instance, used
50 artificial flowers to demonstrate colour discrimination by honey bees, before discovering the
51 symbolic communication by which foragers advertise the location of remote feeding sites to
52 their nestmates by displaying dances on the vertical honey combs (von Frisch, 1967).
53 Tinbergen manipulated the visual appearance of the nests of digger wasps with pine cones and
54 demonstrated that wasps use visual memories to orient themselves and return home
55 (Tinbergen, 1932).

56 Since then, generations of talented entomologists have described a rich diversity of
57 cognitive abilities by which insects sample, process and use information from their
58 environment to adapt their behaviour in different contexts (e.g. mate choice, foraging, egg
59 laying, navigation) at different levels (e.g. as individuals and as groups) and in a variety of
60 taxa (for recent reviews see: Collett et al., 2013; Feinerman and Korman, 2017; Giurfa, 2019,

2013; Papaj and Lewis, 2012; Perry et al., 2017). This research shows that model species (especially bees and fruit flies) achieve ever more impressive cognitive tasks despite their relatively simple neural system. At the individual level, bees are capable of learning concepts (Giurfa et al., 2001), counting (Howard et al., 2018), optimising paths (Lihoreau et al., 2012b), copying others (Alem et al., 2016), innovating (Loukola et al., 2017) and even assessing their chances to solve a task (Perry and Barron, 2013). Some wasps can recognize the faces of their nestmates (Sheehan and Tibbetts, 2016) and fruit flies can socially transmit mate choice preferences across several generations, possibly leading to local traditions (Danchin et al., 2018). At the collective level, ant and bee colonies often make faster and more accurate decisions than isolated conspecifics when selecting food sources (Beckers et al., 1990) or a nesting site (Sasaki et al., 2013; Seeley, 2010), and can efficiently solve mazes (Goss et al., 1989) or transport large food items across complex environments (Gelbium et al., 2015).

Together with the development of new technologies and methods in neurosciences (Dubnau, 2014; Menzel, 2012), this research on insect cognition has progressively moved from the description of sophisticated behaviour in the field to mechanistic investigations of cognitive processes and their neural correlates in the lab. Significant progresses in understanding insect brain organisation and function have been made using genetic mutants (e.g. GAL4/UAS, optogenetics), various imaging techniques, drug injections or screening of gene expression in targeted neuropiles (Guo et al., 2019). We now have a fairly good idea of brain areas, neurons and molecular pathways involved in different forms of associative learning in model species such as fruit flies, honey bees, some ants, moths, cockroaches and crickets (Giurfa, 2013). In particular, the fruit fly *Drosophila melanogaster* has emerged as a key genetic model to address these questions both because of the relative simplicity of its nervous system (mapped at the level of synaptic connectivity (Zheng et al., 2018)) and its rich

behavioural repertoire (both individual and social levels (Sokolowski, 2010)), allowing for the genetic dissection of sophisticated behaviours, such as place learning (Ofstad et al., 2011), flight control (Dickinson and Mujires, 2016), courtship (Pavlou and Goodwin, 2013), grooming (Hampel et al., 2015), memory-driven action selection (Owald and Waddell, 2015) and collective movements (Ramdya et al., 2014).

Although very insightful, the fast development of lab-based mechanistic studies has also reduced the scope of insect cognition research in several ways. First, the focus on the molecular and genetic bases of cognitive processes has limited investigations to few model species that may not express a cognitive repertoire representative of the estimated 5.5 millions insect species (Stork, 2018). While it can be interesting to compare bees, ants and wasps when considering social evolution within the social Hymenoptera (e.g. Farris, 2016; Gronenberg and Riveros, 2009), the comparison with the more phylogenetically distant fruit flies may be less informative (Brenowitz and Zakon, 2015). Second, studies on the mechanisms of learning and memory often rely on hypotheses and paradigms inspired from human experimental psychology that may sometimes bias interpretations of the results, and limit the search for alternative (sometimes more parsimonious) explanations (e.g. Cheung, 2014; Guiraud et al., 2018). Third, research that is exclusively conducted in the lab presents the risk of disconnecting subjects, behaviours and cognitive traits of interest from their natural environment. Testing animals in very artificial setups in order to achieve a high level of control on information available and behavioural responses, does not always allow for the expression of the desired naturalistic behaviours (e.g. Niggebrügge et al., 2009). The questions or approaches used to study insect cognition are often very different from situations animals may face in nature (e.g. study aversive learning using electric shocks, conditioning immobile harnessed insects, testing social insects in isolation). The animals themselves used for testing cognitive abilities often come from long-term laboratory or commercial cultures in

which some traits may be inadvertently selected or counter selected (e.g. commercial bumblebees, drosophila mutant strains). Fourth, the type and levels of stress animals are exposed to may be highly different in the lab and in the field. This can be problematic since several recent studies show that negative or positive experiences can induce emotion-like states in insects that have consequences on their behaviour and performances in cognitive tasks (e.g. drosophila: (Yang et al., 2013); honey bees: (Bateson et al., 2011); bumblebees: (Perry et al., 2016)).

Here we argue that there is a need for complementing current lab-based insect cognition research with more ecologically inspired studies in order to fully understand the diversity and evolution of cognitive traits. In recent years, such approach known as “cognitive ecology” has been fully embraced by behavioural ecologists and experimental psychologists working on vertebrates and proved successful to advance knowledge on the ecological role and evolution of bird and primate cognition (Dukas, 2008, 1998; Dukas and Ratcliffe, 2009; Morand-Ferron et al., 2015; Pritchard et al., 2016). In what follows, we advance that time is ripe for extending this approach to insects. First, we review conceptual frameworks that have been proposed for the evolution insect brain and cognition. We then explain how taking into account the ecological context in which cognitive traits are expressed in nature can help refine these frameworks by designing field-inspired experiments, testing wild animals, bringing lab controlled protocols to the field, as well as comparing more species. Finally, we discuss how technological advances to study insect cognition in ecologically realistic conditions will help develop this comparative approach, by dramatically increasing the number of cognitive tasks and individuals that can be investigated.

2. The evolution of insect brains and cognition

While we are now getting a more accurate picture of what insects can and cannot do (Perry et al., 2017), and which are the brain areas and neural circuits involved in some of these operations (Giurfa, 2013), fundamental questions about why and how cognitive traits evolve in these animals remain poorly understood.

Both social and ecological factors are expected to fashion the evolution of brains and cognitive abilities (Shettleworth, 2009). Since early descriptions of the anatomy of insect nervous system (Dujardin, 1850), many discussions about the evolution of insect brains and cognitive abilities have focused on the influence of social factors (Strausfeld, 2012). Following the ‘social brain hypothesis’ developed to explain the evolution of large brains in social vertebrates, and in particular anthropoid primates (Byrne, 1996; Dunbar, 1998), two hypotheses were recently proposed for insects. Gronenberg and Riveros (2009) suggested that the transition from solitary to gregarious and colony-based social structures has required the expansion of brain regions related to communication, large behavioural repertoires and flexibility. However, behavioural specialization in socially advanced species with division of labour may have led to reduced investment in brain regions underpinning a range of cognitive operations not required anymore, thereby predicting a quadratic relationship between increasing levels of social complexity and brain size (Gronenberg and Riveros, 2009). O’Donnell et al. (2015) proposed that group communication relaxes the need for individual information processing, resulting in a linear decrease of brain size (or brain size areas) with increasing levels of sociality.

Despite many attempts to correlate brain sizes with metrics of social complexity in different insect taxa, empirical supports for a social brain hypothesis are mixed (Farris, 2016; Gordon et al., 2019; Kamhi et al., 2019, 2016; O’Donnell et al., 2015; Riveros et al., 2012). Part of the problem may be methodological (e.g. coarse measures of social complexity and brain sizes, lack of phylogenetical approaches), thus calling for broader comparative analyses

of neuro-anatomical and behavioural studies mapped on phylogenies (Godfrey and Gronenberg, 2019; Lihoreau et al., 2012a). Another difficulty in testing these variants of the social brain hypothesis lies in the unverified assumption that larger behavioural repertoires require larger brains. In fact, many fundamental changes in the complexity of a nervous system may not result in measurable volumetric differences and novel behaviour can emerge from minimal rewiring of existing neurons (Chittka and Niven, 2009).

The strong focus on the importance of social factors for the evolution of brains and cognitive capacities (especially in Hymenoptera) has somehow neglected a number of alternative or complementary hypotheses that have been long developed by vertebrate biologists, such as the importance of diet (DeCasien et al., 2017), maternal care (Curley and Keverne, 2005) or spatial navigation (Jacobs et al., 1990). Ecological conditions are known to fashion the evolution of insect sensory systems and brain anatomy (e.g. vision (Briscoe and Chittka, 2001), olfaction (Hansson and Stensmyr, 2011)). However, the links between ecological constraints and cognitive capacities have been little explored. In an attempt to test these alternative hypotheses in Hymenoptera, Farris and Schulmester (2011) made a careful evaluation of the architecture of the mushroom bodies (central brain structures involved in various forms of visual, olfactory and bimodal memories (Strausfeld, 2012)) in a wide diversity of species and mapped their lifestyles and neural structure onto an established phylogeny. This analysis showed that relatively enlarged mushroom bodies, with elaborate structure and visual and olfactory inputs, evolved 90 million years prior to sociality, in solitary parasitoid wasps (Farris and Schulmeister, 2011). Presumably, the challenge of acquiring spatial memories for locating preys and provisioning larvae (not sociality) may have placed much higher cognitive demands in these first parasitoids than in their herbivorous ancestors. In fact, this cognitive adaptation to spatial orientation may have later favoured the

evolution of central place foraging and the development of large societies sustained by highly efficient visuo-spatial foragers (Farris, 2016).

3. Towards a cognitive ecology of insects

The emerging field of cognitive ecology provides a theoretical and methodological framework to study the ecology and evolution of animal cognition (for reviews see (Dukas, 1998; Dukas and Ratcliffe, 2009)). This involves designing new hypotheses and experiments based field observations, testing wild animals, bringing lab-controlled experimental protocols in the field, taking into account the social context of the cognitive task, and comparing large numbers of species with known ecologies and phylogenetic relationships. While this approach has so far mainly been used for vertebrates, especially birds and mammals (Dukas, 2008; Morand-Ferron et al., 2015; Pritchard et al., 2016), below we highlight some key recent examples in insects.

Identifying new questions and hypotheses from field observations

Field observations are necessary to identify the types of problems animals must solve in their everyday life and how they might do so. The natural environment often contains much more relevant cues for the animals than typically assumed which structures the kind of information they can acquire. Observing insects in their natural environment is thus a fundamental step to design questions, identify competing hypotheses, develop experimental protocols and potentially change paradigms, be the research later conducted in the field or in the lab.

Field observations are particularly important in insect navigation research since spatial orientation behaviours are not always easily expressed in the lab, because of the limited spatial scales of lab-setups and the incomplete set of environmental cues available to insects. In bees, field observations have recently moved the historical focus on single destination

209 route following to multi-destination route learning and optimisation (Lihoreau et al., 2013). In
210 an attempt to study long-distance pollination by orchid bees in the Costa Rican rain forest,
211 Janzen (1971) observed that some individuals often visited the same set of plants each day,
212 probably in the same order. Given that bees are often assumed to visit hundreds of flowers
213 during a single foraging trip (von Frisch, 1967), this anecdotic observation has initiated
214 several research programs investigating how bees develop routes linking many familiar sites
215 (Lihoreau et al., 2012b; Ohashi et al., 2007; Woodgate et al., 2017), for how long route
216 memory is effective (Thomson, 1996), and how individuals achieve this behaviour while
217 minimizing competition with other nectar foragers (Ohashi et al., 2008; Pasquaretta et al.,
218 2019). In ants, field observations have raised new questions about how insects use
219 environmental cues to solve orientation challenges. In the Australian desert, thermal
220 turbulences due to solar heating of the ground create frequent wind gusts and it is not rare to
221 see ants getting blown away from their familiar route. Even a small displacement of a few
222 meters (i.e. several hundreds of body lengths for an ant) constitutes a big challenge for the ant
223 to find back its original position. Based on this observation, desert ants (*Melophorus bagoti*)
224 were observed reo-rientating in the field after being experimentally displaced by wind gusts
225 of leaf blower into a dark pit (Wystrach and Schwartz, 2013). When released at windless
226 unfamiliar locations, ants headed in a compass direction opposite to the one they had been
227 blown away, thus functionally increasing their chance of returning to familiar areas. Analyses
228 of ant behaviour indicate that encoding of wind direction relative to sun position occurs
229 before being displaced, while clutching the ground to resist the wind (Wystrach and Schwartz,
230 2013). Field observations that ball-rolling dung beetles (*Scarabaeus lamarcki*) also appear to
231 use wind in addition to the sun for spatial orientation have raised the question of how insects
232 may use multimodal compass cues for navigation and inspired lab experiments in which sun
233 and wind cues can be delivered in a tightly controlled manner (Dacke et al., 2019). In this

setup, beetles were found to register information provided by the sun and the wind, and directional information can be transferred between these two sensory modalities, suggesting that they combine in the spatial memory network in the beetle's brain. This flexible use of compass cue preferences relative to the prevailing visual and mechanisms scenery provides a simple, yet effective, mechanism for enabling compass orientation at any time of the day when one type of cues may not be available (Dacke et al., 2019).

Field observations can also been pivotal to understand cognitive processes in populations of animals, such as the collective decision-making processes underpinning the onset of insect swarms (Bazazi et al., 2008; Simpson et al., 2006). During population outbreaks, Mormon crickets (*Anabrus simplex*) form marching bands of several kilometres long, comprising millions of individuals moving en masse (Sword et al., 2005). Field observations of migratory bands indicated that many dead insects were left behind, as well as some carcasses of small vertebrates, suggesting that populations of sedentary herbivorous crickets swarm in response a local depletion of key nutrients (Simpson et al., 2006). Giving migrating crickets a choice between artificial diets varying in their nutritional composition in the field demonstrated that crickets in migratory bands are deprived of protein and mineral salts, which triggers their cannibalistic interactions. The crickets are in effect on a forced march, whereby individuals move ahead to try to eat conspecifics while escaping cannibalism by others in their back (Simpson et al., 2006).

Testing wild animals

Running experiments on wild animals offers the opportunity to assess important inter-individual variations in behaviour and cognition that are potentially shaped by environmental conditions, thereby providing a link between cognitive performances and the ecological context (Morand-Ferron et al., 2015).

In fruit flies (*D. melanogaster*), the utilization of wild-caught individuals for behavioural experiments has revealed the existence of natural allelic variations of the gene *foraging*, which encodes a cGMP-dependant protein kinase (PKG) that affects the motor behaviour and social interactions of larvae and adults (Sokolowski, 1980). Sitter flies (*for^S*) are more sedentary and tend to aggregate within food patches, whereas rover flies (*for^R*) to move more within and between food patches and are less gregarious (Sokolowski, 2010). These two natural behavioural variants are maintained at appreciable frequencies (ca. 70% rovers, 30% sitters) in nature (Sokolowski, 1980) and in the lab through negative frequency dependent selection (Fitzpatrick et al., 2007). Rovers and sitters also show important differences in their cognitive abilities. Rovers express stronger proboscis extension responses following a sucrose stimulation of their tarsi and show slower habituation of this response after multiple stimulations than sitters (Scheiner et al., 2004). Rovers develop better short-term aversive olfactory memory but poorer long-term memory than sitters (Mery et al., 2007). Interestingly, these two behavioural variants also differ in their ability to use social information. In a spatial task, where flies must learn to locate a safe zone in an aversively heated arena (i.e. invertebrate version of the Morris water maze), rovers rely more on personal information whereas sitters tend to primarily use social cues (Foucaud et al., 2013). These results suggest that both the utilization of information types and the cognitive performances of the two genotypes are co-adapted with their effects on foraging behaviour: the highly exploratory rovers could particularly benefit from fast learning based on individual information, whereas the more sedentary sitters should benefit more from social information and good long-term memory.

Wild populations are characterised by natural levels of genetic diversity that can greatly impact levels of behavioural variability in cognitive tests. Experiments with German cockroaches (*B. germanica*) from different laboratory strains showed that individuals can

discriminate between conspecifics with different genetic backgrounds, favouring aggregations with partners from the same strain (Rivault et al., 1998; Rivault and Cloarec, 1998) but mating with partners from different strains (Lihoreau et al., 2007). Intra-strain (kin) discrimination, however, was only demonstrated later, in studies using wild-caught cockroaches sampled in separate geographic areas, showing that behavioural discrimination is based on quantitative differences in chemical signatures (i.e. cuticular hydrocarbon profiles) correlated with the genetic distance between individuals (Lihoreau et al., 2016b). The potential lack of genetic diversity in lab cultures maintained for long periods of time (highly inbred, no information about genetic background) may be a reason why kin recognition has been observed so rarely in insects (Fellowes, 1998; van Zweden and D'Ettorre, 2010).

Bringing experimental protocols in the field

Insect cognition research is largely based on well-defined paradigms designed to investigate specific cognitive traits (Giurfa, 2013). While this provides the advantage of allowing the identification of what animals can do, it may not, however, always reflect what animals actually do in the wild (Pritchard et al., 2016).

Firstly, important stimuli yielding information necessary for the expression of targeted behaviour may be absent in the lab. This is well illustrated by studies on visual cognition. Bees are capable of various forms of visual associative learning and memories used to locate and discriminate flowers, as well as developing routes between them (Avarguès-Weber et al., 2011). To control for the visual experience of bees, the spatial distribution of flowers and their rewarding value, bees spatial foraging strategies have been studied in the lab using artificial flowers in small flight arenas, flight rooms or greenhouses. In many bee species, foragers allowed to exploit an arrays of artificial flowers over several consecutive hours tend to develop repeatable flower visitation sequences (Lihoreau et al., 2010; Ohashi et al., 2007;

309 Saleh and Chittka, 2007), a behaviour called “trapline foraging” (Thomson et al., 1997).
310 Replicating these experiments in the field, using a harmonic radar to record the flight
311 trajectories of individual bees at much larger ecologically relevant spatial scales, revealed that
312 bees establish routes minimizing travel distances between all flowers and the nest based on
313 long-term memories (Lihoreau et al., 2012b; Woodgate et al., 2017). In this case, both the
314 increased spatial scales (e.g. longer travel distances associated to higher energetic costs) and
315 the access to celestial cues (e.g. sun compass) dramatically accelerated the dynamics of route
316 formation and improved the optimization performance of bees in the field setup.

317 Another major advantage of adapting lab experiments to the field is to avoid potential
318 sources of stress inherent to the lab. Even if insect species can be brought into the lab and the
319 spatial scale and the information available to the insects were appropriate for understanding
320 the behaviour of interest, the insect itself may still experience the lab task very differently
321 than if it were presented with an analogous task in the wild. Again, research on bee visual
322 cognition provides a good illustration of how lab-based protocols can be adapted to the field
323 to tackle this problem. One of the most common paradigm for investigating learning and
324 memory in honey bees is the conditioning of the proboscis extension reflex (PER), which
325 tests for associations between an unconditional stimulus (sucrose reward) and a conditional
326 stimulus (e.g. colour or scent) in harnessed bees (Takeda, 1961). This approach has the
327 advantage of enabling the control for the timing of stimulus presentation (e.g. sequence of
328 stimulus exposure, number of trials, inter-trial duration). While PER conditioning has been
329 incredibly insightful to study olfactory cognition at the behavioural, neurobiological and
330 molecular levels (Giurfa and Sandoz, 2012), it has always given poor or contrasted results
331 with visual stimulations (e.g. some authors report the necessity to amputate antennae to obtain
332 good learning (Kuwabara, 1957; Niggebrügge et al., 2009)) and have never reached the usual
333 levels observed in free-flying bees (Avarguès-Weber et al., 2011). Considering that bees

predominantly use vision in flight, motion cues probably provide more natural visual context that participate to maintain a close dependence between visual and motor processing. The immobilization of the bee in visual-PER studies undoubtedly disrupts this feedback loop (Avarguès-Weber and Mota, 2016). To address this issue, Muth et al. (2018) developed a field version of PER conditioning with freely moving insects in which animals reach high performance levels. This new protocol allows for testing visual associative learning and memory of different species of bees in a less stressful environment, while controlling for stimulus presentation as well as allowing tests in field conditions on wild populations (Muth et al., 2018).

Taking into account the social context

The difference between the lab and the natural conditions under which an animal usually learns is sometimes not just physical (Pritchard et al., 2016). While many standard cognitive tests are performed on isolated insects (Giurfa, 2013; Menzel, 2012), key model species such as drosophila, honey bees and ants live in groups (Sokolowski, 2010; Wilson, 1971). A number of social factors may thus influence what the insects can learn or how they express their learning behaviour.

At the most basic level, some behaviours are simply not expressed out of the social context. In an attempt to test the hypothesis that division of labour in social insects emerges from inherent inter-individual variation in response thresholds to environmental stimuli (i.e. the response threshold hypothesis (Beshers and Fewell, 2001)), the behaviour of individual ants (*Temnothorax rugatulus*) was compared in different social contexts. When isolated, ants show highly variable responses to task-associated stimuli and these responses are not correlated to their behaviour in the colony, suggesting that testing ants outside of a social context alters the meaning or salience of the experimental stimuli and thus the observed

behavioural response (Leitner et al., 2019). These social effects on cognition can also be developmental. In many gregarious insects, prolonged periods of social isolation can have dramatic developmental consequences and induce long-term behavioural disturbances known as “group effects” (Grassé, 1946). In the German cockroach (*Blattella germanica*), individuals experimentally reared in isolation during nymphal development show lower exploratory activities, foraging behaviour, and abilities to process social stimuli as adults (Lihoreau et al., 2009). This behavioural syndrome of social isolation can be partially rescued through social contacts artificially provided to cockroaches through mechanical stimulations (Lihoreau and Rivault, 2008; Uzsak and Schal, 2013).

Social interactions can also modulate learning and memory performances. In fruit flies (*D. melanogaster*), social interactions facilitates the retrieval of olfactory memory (Chabaud et al., 2009). Flies trained to associate an electric shock to an odour in a T-maze develop two forms of long-lasting memories depending on inter trial intervals: long-term memory (LTM) is formed after spaced conditioning (short intervals), whereas anaesthesia-resistant memory (ARM) is formed after massed conditioning (long intervals) (Margulies et al., 2006). However, flies have higher ARM scores when tested in groups than in isolation (Chabaud et al., 2009). This social effect is independent of the social condition of training, of the experience of other flies in the group and is specific to ARM, indicating that it does not simply result from aggregation dynamics. Presumably, trained flies produce stress signals (e.g. CO₂ (Yang et al., 2013)) that alarms their conspecifics and enhances their attention or motivation to respond during memory retrieval. In honey bees (*A. mellifera*), social condition during breeding influences olfactory learning. Adults raised in large groups show better learning but no higher memory scores than conspecifics raised in small groups or in complete isolation (Tsvetkov et al., 2019). These differences are correlated with changes in dopamine

levels in the brain suggesting that social interactions modulate learning through the biogenic amines.

Being in a group can also dramatically improve the speed and accuracy of decision-making through collective acquisition and processing of information, a phenomena known as “swarm intelligence” (Couzin, 2009; Feinerman and Korman, 2017; Seeley, 2010). In house hunting ants (*T. rugatulus*), collective decisions for the selection of a new nest site emerge from a competition between recruitment efforts by different individuals in the form of tandem running (i.e. an experienced ant drags a naïve ant towards a site) at different sites (Franks et al., 2002). When given a choice between potential nest sites varying in quality (e.g. light intensity), ant colonies can effectively compare a larger option set than individuals (Sasaki and Pratt, 2012) and are less vulnerable to irrational preference shifts induced by decoys (Sasaki and Pratt, 2011). However, this social advantage varies with the difficulty of the task to solve (Sasaki et al., 2013). For a difficult choice (i.e. small differences of light intensity between nests), solitary ants have a relatively high probability of accepting the worst nest, because they rely on quality dependent acceptance probabilities that differ little for similar nests. Colonies do much better because the colony’s choice emerges from a competition between recruitment efforts accentuated by a positive feedback loop and a quorum rule (Sasaki et al., 2013). For an easy choice (i.e. large differences in light intensity between nests), acceptance probabilities diverge rapidly with comparison, allowing solitary ants to make the right choice with high probability. Thus in this case social information only adds little benefit to colonies if not a cost (when random fluctuations lead the colony towards the wrong choice).

Comparing species

407 Rigorous comparisons of the cognitive performances of individuals of the same species or
408 different species that are either closely or distantly related can greatly enhance our
409 understanding of how cognition is shaped by natural selection (Godfrey and Gronenberg,
410 2019).

411 Studies of closely related species with known ecologies is a powerful means to tease
412 apart selective forces that drive the evolution of specific cognitive traits. In paper wasps such
413 comparison demonstrates the importance of sociality in the evolution of visual cognition
414 (Sheehan and Tibbetts, 2011). Queens of *Polistes fuscatus* cooperate to found, defend and
415 provision their colony. These wasps live in strict hierarchical societies in which individuals
416 recognise every other colony members based on long-term memories of facial masks
417 (Sheehan and Tibbetts, 2008). By contrast, queens of *P. metricus* found colonies alone and do
418 not require face recognition. When presented images of normal wasp faces, manipulated wasp
419 faces, simple geometric patterns or caterpillars (i.e. the typical prey of these wasps) in an
420 aversive conditioning paradigm in a Y-maze, *P. fuscatus* wasps learn to recognize correctly
421 configured wasp faces more quickly and more accurately than they did with other images,
422 indicating that face learning is specific to faces in this species (Sheehan and Tibbetts, 2011).
423 *P. metricus* wasps, however, perform better in pattern and caterpillar discrimination. In terms
424 of gross neuroanatomy, there are no discernible differences between the visual system of *P.*
425 *fuscatus* and closely related species that do not show face recognition (Gronenberg et al.,
426 2008). It is therefore likely that the neural circuitry used by insects for prey recognition has
427 been co-opted for face recognition, provided minor adjustments. In parasitoid wasps that lay
428 eggs in animal hosts, differences in the spatial distribution of preys seems to determine major
429 differences in olfactory memory dynamics (Smid et al., 2007). *Cotesia glomerata* and *C.*
430 *rubecula* wasps coexist in the same environments and lay their eggs in caterpillars. These
431 parasitoids are known to learn to associate plant odours with the presence of caterpillars

during an oviposition experience on a plant (Lewis and Takasu, 1990). When wasps of both species are trained to oviposit on caterpillars on a neutral host plant and then given a choice between the neutral host plant and their preferred host plant (cabbage), *C. glomerata* show memory formation after fewer trials and faster memory consolidation than *C. rubecula* (Smid et al., 2007). This difference in memory dynamics reflects the difference in foraging ecology of the two species: *C. glomerata* exploits gregarious hosts and may benefit to learn from one massed experience on a single encounter with a plant, whereas *C. rubecula* exploit solitary hosts and may use more experiences and more time to evaluate information from many different plants before long-term memory is formed.

Comparing distantly related species can help identify cognitive traits that are conserved or are convergent across insect lineages. In recent years, the finding that many insect taxa are capable of social learning, suggests that this cognitive ability once thought to be unique to vertebrates has evolved several times in insects. Forms of social learning have been demonstrated in insects exhibiting various levels of social organisation, including social bees that can learn new flower preferences (Worden and Papaj, 2005) or foraging techniques (Alem et al., 2016; Loukola et al., 2017), gregarious fruit flies that can learn preferences for oviposition sites (Battesti et al., 2015) or mating partners (Danchin et al., 2018), or even solitary field crickets that learn about the presence of danger (Coolen et al., 2005). This comparative research demonstrates that insect social learning is not a specific adaptation to social life but may rather involves fundamental associative learning processes common to many species and used in an asocial context (Leadbeater and Dawson, 2017).

4. Future directions

Perhaps with the exception of navigation research (Collett et al., 2013), ecologically-inspired studies of insect cognition are still relatively scarce, presumably because of the technical

difficulties to run controlled experiments with many insect species in their natural environment (e.g. fast moving animals, large spatial scales, large numbers of individuals etc.). However, several technological advances to quantify cognitive performances on freely moving insects in the field or in field-realistic virtual environments in the lab hold considerable promises for the development of insect cognitive ecology combining field and lab approaches.

Automated quantification of cognitive performances

A major limitation of current insect cognition research is that many experiments involve long protocols (e.g. training sessions over several days (Perry et al., 2016)) with relatively low levels of success (e.g. low learning scores (Avarguès-Weber and Mota, 2016)), often resulting in small sample sizes that do not enable for analyses of cognitive variability. Developing a truly comparative analysis of cognitive performances within individuals through time, as well as between individuals, population and species requires the development of non-invasive automated systems to record behavioural data on large numbers of insects over long periods of times.

This can be achieved by automatizing cognitive protocols. Although many standard protocols have been improved for automatically controlling the presentation of conditioned and unconditioned stimuli to animals (e.g. appetitive olfactory conditioning in bees (Giurfa and Sandoz, 2012), aversive visual conditioning in bees (Kirkerud et al., 2013), aversive olfactory conditioning in drosophila (Jiang et al., 2016)), the full automation of experimental setups for conducting cognitive tests is still rare. A recent successful example includes the development of arrays of automated feeders fitted with tracking systems to test flower choices, spatial learning and social interactions in freely flying bees in the lab (Ohashi et al., 2010) and in the field (Lihoreau et al., 2016a). In this approach, a large number of insects can

self-train for several consecutive days without the intervention of an experimenter (Pasquaretta et al., 2019).

Advances in automated movement tracking systems now also enable to quantify the behaviour of individual insects, while walking or flying, at various spatial and temporal scales, in the lab and in the field. These include computer vision (e.g. Pérez-Escudero et al., 2014), radio frequency identification (e.g. Stroeymeyt et al., 2018), telemetry (e.g. Kissling et al., 2014), and radar tracking (e.g. Riley et al., 1996). Recent studies have begun to complement these behavioural measures with continuous recording of fitness data, population dynamics and environmental conditions (e.g. Crall et al., 2018). In bee research, for instance, connected hives (i.e. bee hives equipped with sets of sensors) can be used for the continuous monitoring of colony traits (e.g. temperature, humidity, weight, sound, traffic of foragers, social interactions, nectar and pollen collection) and environmental conditions (e.g. weather, air pollution) (Bromenshenk et al., 2015). This technological advance has opened the door for a real-time assessment of the link between insect cognitive performance, in-nest behaviour, colony health status, environmental quality and stress exposure (Meikle and Holst, 2015).

High-throughput monitoring of insect behaviour can only be insightful if combined with modern statistical methods to automatically analyse behavioural data. Approaches of machine learning and statistical physics are increasingly used to run unsupervised behavioural classification enabling to handle large behavioural datasets, discover features that humans cannot, and develop standard metrics for comparing data across species and labs with only few prior assumptions (Brown and de Bivort, 2018; Egnor and Branson, 2016).

Virtual reality on freely moving insects

The development of ecologically inspired lab-based experiments in which animals can express naturalistic behaviours under tightly controlled conditions is complementary to field

research. While many classical protocols for testing learning and memory in the lab requires to immobilize insects (e.g. (Giurfa and Sandoz, 2012)), recent progresses in virtual reality techniques now provide unprecedented opportunities to test freely behaving animals in complex (ecologically relevant) virtual environments, in which cues can be manipulated independently, in ways that would be impossible to achieve in traditional experiments (Stowers et al., 2017). These new systems in which the natural sensorimotor experience of animals is conserved, facilitate detailed investigations into neural function and behaviour. Virtual reality for freely moving animals has recently been used to elicit naturalistic object responses (e.g. make objects appear, disappear, or even be at apparent distances) in freely walking and flying insects. For instance, flying bumblebees (*Bombus terrestris*) can be trained to search for virtual feeding platform or avoid virtual obstacles displayed on a screen on the ground of a flight arena (Frasnelli et al., 2018).

Future developments of technologies to measure neural activities in freely moving insects will considerably advance investigations of brain function underpinning these naturalistic behaviours (Marescotti et al., 2018). Combining these technologies to virtual reality will allow researchers to study the mechanistic basis of behaviour under conditions in which the brain evolved to operate, thereby facilitating the dialogue between field and lab cognitive experiments in ecologically relevant conditions.

5. Concluding remarks

In the 1980s and the 1990s, the intersection of behavioural ecology and experimental psychology led to the new field of cognitive ecology (Dukas, 1998; Dukas and Ratcliffe, 2009) as researchers began to base their hypotheses on the natural history of different species to test predictions about the cognitive abilities of these animals. This approach has been taken with success by researchers working on large-brained animals (Morand-Ferron et al., 2015),

but is still little embraced by entomologists. Here we argue that there is a need for developing an ecologically inspired research on insect cognition to develop a comprehensive understanding of both its mechanisms and evolution.

Beyond behavioural ecologists, such approach will benefit to the broad community of researchers interested in insect cognition. Considering the ecological context of cognition will likely help ethologists to make sense of the rich cognitive repertoire of insects observed in the lab (e.g. What does it mean for an insect colony to have optimistic and pessimistic foragers? Why should insects count?) and perhaps refine mechanistic explanations by asking alternative hypotheses inspired from field observations. Ecological considerations of cognition may also help neurobiologists and experimental psychologists interested in the evolution of cognition to understand the role of environmental factors in shaping animal behaviour and cognitive abilities. As the cognitive abilities of more species are studied in the environment in which such processes evolved, the prospects of a truly comparative study of cognition look bright. Importantly, the ecologically-inspired approach is complementary with lab-based mechanistic explorations. Some of these explorations can also be performed in the field, for instance using selective drugs (Sovik et al., 2016) or inhibitor of gene expression (Cheng et al., 2015) to identify physiological pathways underpinning cognitive operations in conditions where animals may be in better position to fully express their cognitive repertoire.

Ultimately the dialogue between ecologically-based and lab-based approaches will help develop a more integrative understanding of insect cognition with the potential to illuminate broader scale ecological phenomena. For instance, detailed studies of the sublethal effects of pesticides on bee learning and memory (Stanley et al., 2015) combined with field monitoring of population dynamics (e.g. Henry et al., 2012) have provided a robust explanation for colony collapse and the broader declines of pollinator populations (Klein et al., 2017). Growing evidence show that cognitive processes observed in individual organisms

result from complex interactions between components at different levels of organisation (gut microbiota, group, parasites and pathogens, environmental stressors) (Couzin, 2009; Cryan and Dinan, 2012). Considering these ecological interactions and their consequences throughout levels of organisations is a major challenge for insect cognition research in the decades to come.

Acknowledgements

This work was funded by CNRS and a research grant of the Agence Nationale de la Recherche to ML (ANR-16-CE02-0002-01). While writing TD and CM were supported by joint PhD fellowships of the University of Toulouse III and Macquarie University, SK was supported by a CIFRE PhD fellowship (CNRS-Koppert Biological Systems), TGM and CP were supported by the ANR.

References

- Alem, S., Perry, C.J., Zhu, X., Loukola, O.J., Ingraham, T., Sovik, E., Chittka, L., 2016. Associative mechanisms allow for social learning and cultural transmission of string pulling in an insect. *PLoS Biol* 14, e1002564.
- Avarguès-Weber, A., Deisig, N., Giurfa, M., 2011. Visual cognition in social insects. *Ann Rev Entomol* 56, 423–443.
- Avarguès-Weber, A., Mota, T., 2016. Advances and limitations of visual conditioning protocols in harnessed bees. *J Physiol Paris* 110, 107–118.
- Bateson, M., Desire, S., Gartside, S.E., Wright, G.A., 2011. Agitated honeybees exhibit pessimistic cognitive biases. *Curr Biol* 21, 1070–1073.
- Battesti, M., Pasquaretta, C., Moreno, C., Teseo, S., Joly, D., Klensch, E., Petit, O., Sueur, C., Mery, F., 2015. Ecology of information: social transmission dynamics within groups of non-social insects. *Proc R Soc B* 282, 20142480.
- Bazazi, S., Buhl, J., Hale, J.J., Anstey, M.L., Sword, G.A., Simpson, S.J., Couzin, I.D., 2008. Collective motion and cannibalism in locust migratory bands. *Curr Biol* 18, 735–739.
- Beckers, R., Deneubourg, J.L., Goss, S., Pasteels, J.M., 1990. Collective decision making through food recruitment. *Insectes Soc* 37, 258–267. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02224053>
- Beshers, S.N., Fewell, J., 2001. Models of division of labor in social insects. *Annu Rev Entomol* 46, 413–440.
- Brenowitz, E.A., Zakon, H.H., 2015. Emerging from the bottleneck: benefits of the comparative approach to modern neuroscience. *Trends Neurosci* 38, 273–278.
- Briscoe, A.D., Chittka, L., 2001. The evolution of color vision in insects. *Annu Rev Entomol* 46, 471–510.

592 Bromenshenk, J., Henderson, C., Seccomb, R., Welch, P., Debnam, S., Firth, D., 2015. Bees
 593 as biosensors: chemosensory ability, honey bee monitoring systems, and emergent sensor
 594 technologies derived from the pollinator syndrome. *Biosensors* 5, 678–711.
 595 <https://doi.org/10.3390/bios5040678>
 596 Brown, A.E.X., de Bivort, B., 2018. Ethology as a physical science. *Nature Physics* 14, 653–
 597 657. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41567-018-0093-0>
 598 Byrne, R., 1996. Machiavellian intelligence. *Evol Anthropol* 5, 172–180.
 599 Chabaud, M.-A., Isabel, G., Kaiser, L., Preat, T., 2009. Social facilitation of long-lasting
 600 memory retrieval in *Drosophila*. *Curr Biol* 19, 1654–1659.
 601 Cheng, D., Lu, Y., Zeng, G., He, X., 2015. Si-CSP9 regulates the integument and moulting
 602 process of larvae in the red imported fire ant, *Solenopsis invicta*. *Sci Rep* 5, 9245.
 603 Cheung, A., 2014. Still no convincing evidence for cognitive map use by honeybees.
 604 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*.
 605 Chittka, L., Niven, J., 2009. Are bigger brains better? *Curr Biol* 19, R995–R1008.
 606 Collett, M., Chittka, L., Collett, T.S., 2013. Spatial memory in insect navigation. *Curr Biol*
 607 23, R789–800. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2013.07.020>
 608 Coolen, I., Dangles, O., Casas, J., 2005. Social learning in non-colonial insects? *Curr Biol* 15,
 609 1931–1935.
 610 Couzin, I.D., 2009. Collective cognition in animals. *Trends Cognit Sci* 13, 36–43.
 611 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2008.10.002>
 612 Crall, J.D., Switzer, C.M., Oppenheimer, R.L., Versypt, A., Dey, B., Brown, A., Eyster, M.,
 613 Guérin, C., Pierce, N.E., Combes, S.A., de Bivort, B.L., 2018. Neonicotinoid exposure
 614 disrupts bumblebee nest behavior, social networks, and thermoregulation. *Science* 362, 683–
 615 686. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aat1598>, 2018.
 616 Cryan, J.F., Dinan, T.G., 2012. Mind-altering microorganisms: the impact of the gut
 617 microbiota on brain and behaviour. *Nat Rev Neurosci* 13, 701–712.
 618 Curley, J.P., Keverne, E.B., 2005. Genes, brains and mammalian social bonds. *Trends Ecol*
 619 *Evol* 20, 561–567.
 620 Dacke, M., Bell, A.T.A., Foster, J.J., Baird, E.J., Strube-Bloss, M.F., Byrne, M.J., el Jundi,
 621 B., 2019. Multimodal cue integration in the dung beetle compass. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*
 622 116, 14248–14253.
 623 Danchin, E., Nöbel, S., Pocheville, A., Dagaëff, A.C., Demary, L., Alphand, M., Ranty-Roby,
 624 S., van Renssen, L., Monier, M., Gazagne, E., Allain, M., Isabel, G., 2018. Cultural flies:
 625 Conformist social learning in fruitflies predicts long-lasting mate-choice traditions. *Science*
 626 362, 1025–1030.
 627 DeCasien, A.R., Williams, S.A., Higham, J.P., 2017. Primate brain size is predicted by diet
 628 but not sociality. *Nature Ecol Evol* 1, 112.
 629 Dickinson, M.H., Mujires, F.T., 2016. The aerodynamics and control of free flight
 630 manoeuvres in *Drosophila*. *Phil Trans R Soc B* 371, 20150388.
 631 Dubnau, J., 2014. *Behavioural Genetics of the Fly (Drosophila melanogaster)*. Cambridge
 632 University Press, Cambridge, UK.
 633 Dujardin, F., 1850. Mémoire sur le système nerveux des insectes. *Ann Sci Nat Zool* 14, 195–
 634 206.
 635 Dukas, R., 2008. Evolutionary biology of insect learning. *Ann Rev Entomol* 53, 145–160.
 636 Dukas, R., 1998. *Cognitive Ecology: The Evolutionary Ecology of Information Processing*
 637 *and Decision Making*, The University of Chicago Press. ed.
 638 Dukas, R., Ratcliffe, J.M., 2009. *Cognitive ecology II*, University of Chicago Press. ed.
 639 Dunbar, R.I.M., 1998. The social brain hypothesis. *Evol Anthropol* 6, 178–190.
 640 Egnor, S.E.R., Branson, K., 2016. Computational analysis of behavior. *Annual review of*
 641 *neuroscience* 39, 217–236.

642 Fabre, J.H., 1882. *Nouveaux Souvenirs Entomologiques: Etudes sur l'Instinct et les Moeurs*
643 *des Insectes*, Librairie Delagrave. ed. Paris.

644 Farris, S.M., 2016. Insect societies and the social brain. *Curr Opin Insect Sci* 15, 1–8.

645 Farris, S.M., Schulmeister, S., 2011. Parasitoidism, not sociality, is associated with the the
646 evolution of elaborate mushroom bodies in the brains of hymenopteran insects. *Proc R Soc B*
647 278, 940–951.

648 Feinerman, O., Korman, A., 2017. Individual versus collective cognition in social insects. *J*
649 *Exp Biol* 220, 73–82.

650 Fellowes, M.D.E., 1998. Do non-social insects get the (kin) recognition they deserve? *Ecol*
651 *Entomol* 23, 223–227.

652 Fitzpatrick, M.J., Feder, E., Rowe, L., Sokolowski, M.B., 2007. Maintaining a behaviour
653 polyphenism by frequency-dependent selection on a single gene. *Nature* 447, 210–213.

654 Foucaud, J., Philippe, A.-S., Moreno, C., Mery, F., 2013. A genetic polymorphism affecting
655 reliance on personal versus public information in a spatial learning task in *Drosophila*
656 *melanogaster*. *Proc R Soc B* 280, 20130588.

657 Franks, N.R., Pratt, S.C., Mallon, E.B., Britton, N.F., Sumpter, D.J.T., 2002. Information
658 flow, opinion polling and collective intelligence in house-hunting social insects. *Philos Trans*
659 *R Soc Lond B Biol Sci* 357, 1567–1583.

660 Frasnelli, E., Hempel de Ibarra, N., Stewart, F.J., 2018. The dominant role of visual motion
661 cues in bumblebee flight control revealed through virtual reality. *Front Psychol* 9, 1038.
662 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01038>

663 Gelbium, A., Pinkoviezky, I., Fonio, E., Ghosh, A., Gov, N., Feinerman, O., 2015. Ant groups
664 optimally amplify the effect of transiently informed individuals. *Nature Com* 6, 7729.

665 Giurfa, M., 2019. Honeybees foraging for numbers. *J Comp Physiol A* 1–12.

666 Giurfa, M., 2013. Cognition with few neurons: higher-order learning in insects. *Trends Cognit*
667 *Sci* 36, 285–294.

668 Giurfa, M., Sandoz, J.C., 2012. Invertebrate learning and memory: fifty years of olfactory
669 conditioning of the proboscis extension response in honeybees. *Learn Mem* 19, 54–66.

670 Giurfa, M., Zhang, S., Jenett, A., Menzel, R., Srinivasan, M., 2001. The concepts of
671 “sameness” and “difference” in an insect. *Nature* 410, 930–933.

672 Godfrey, R.K., Gronenberg, W., 2019. Brain evolution in social insects: advocating for the
673 comparative approach. *J Comp Physiol A*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00359-019-01315-7>

674 Gordon, D.G., Zelaya, A., Arganda-Carreras, I., Arganda, S., Traniello, J.F.A., 2019. Division
675 of labor and brain evolution in insect societies: Neurobiology of extreme specialization in the
676 turtle ant *Cephalotes varians*. *PLoS One* 14, e0213618.

677 Goss, S., Aron, S., Deneubourg, J.L., Pasteels, J.M., 1989. Self-organized shortcuts in the
678 Argentine ant. *Naturwissenschaften* 76, 579–581. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00462870>

679 Grassé, P.P., 1946. Sociétés animales et effet de groupe. *Experientia* 2, 77–82.

680 Gronenberg, W., Ash, L.E., Tibbetts, E.A., 2008. Correlation between facial pattern
681 recognition and brain composition in paper wasps. *Brain Behav Evol* 71, 1–14.

682 Gronenberg, W., Riveros, A.J., 2009. Social brains and behavior - past and present, in:
683 *Organization of Insect Societies: From Genome to Sociocomplexity*. Harvard University
684 Press, Cambridge, MA, pp. 377–401.

685 Guiraud, M., Roper, M., Chittka, L., 2018. High-speed videography reveals how honeybees
686 can turn a spatial concept learning task into a simple discrimination task by stereotyped flight
687 movements and sequential inspection of pattern elements. *Front Psychol* 9, 1347.
688 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01347>

689 Guo, C., Pan, Y., Gong, Z., 2019. Recent advances in the genetic dissection of neural circuits
690 in *Drosophila*. *Neurosci Bull*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12264-019-00390-9>.

691 Hampel, S., Franconville, R., Simpson, J.H., Seeds, A.M., 2015. A neural command circuit

for grooming movement control. *eLife* 4, e08758.

Hansson, B.S., Stensmyr, M.C., 2011. Evolution of insect cognition. *Annu Rev Entomol* 72, 698–711.

Henry, M., Béguin, M., Requier, F., Rollin, O., Odoux, J.F., Aupinel, P., Aptel, J., Tchamitchian, S., Decourtye, A., 2012. A common pesticide decreases foraging success and survival in honey bees. *Science* 336, 348–350.

Howard, S.R., Avarguès-Weber, A., Garcia, J.E., Greentree, A.D., Dyer, A.G., 2018. Numerical ordering of zero in honey bees. *Science* 360, 1124–1126.

Jacobs, L.F., Gaulin, S.J.C., Sherry, D.F., Hoffman, G.E., 1990. Evolution of spatial cognition: sex-specific patterns of spatial behaviour predict hippocampal size. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 87, 6349–6352.

Janzen, D.H., 1971. Euglossine bees as long-distance pollinators of tropical plants. *Science* 171, 203–205. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.171.3967.203>

Jiang, H., Hanna, E., Gatto, C.L., Page, T.L., Bhuva, B., Broadie, K., 2016. A fully automated *Drosophila* olfactory classical conditioning and testing system for behavioral learning and memory assessment. *J Neurosci Meth* 261, 62–74.

Kamhi, J.F., Gronenberg, W., Robson, S.K.A., Traniello, F.A., 2016. Social complexity influences brain investment and neural operation costs in ants. *Proc R Soc B* 283, 20161949. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2016.1949>

Kamhi, J.F., Llies, I., Traniello, J.F.A., 2019. Social complexity and brain evolution: comparative analysis of modularity and integration in ant brain organization. *Brain Behav Evol* 93, 4–18.

Kirkerud, N.H., Wehmann, H.N., Galizia, C. G., Gustav, D., 2013. APIS-a novel approach for conditioning honey bees. *Front Behav Neurosci* 7, 29.

Kissling, W.D., Pattermore, D.E., Hagen, M., 2014. Challenges and prospects in the telemetry of insects. *Biol Rev* 89, 511–530.

Klein, S., Cabirol, A., Devaud, J.M., Barron, A.B., Lihoreau, M., 2017. Why bees are so vulnerable to environmental stressors. *Trends Ecol Evol* 32, 268–278. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2016.12.009>

Kuwabara, M., 1957. Bildung des bedingten reflexes von Pavlovs typus bei der honigbiene, *Apis mellifica*. *J Fac Sci Hokkaido Uni Series VI Zool* 13, 458–464.

Leadbeater, E., Dawson, E.H., 2017. A social insect perspective on the evolution of social learning mechanisms. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 114, 7838–7845.

Leitner, N., Lynch, C., Dornhaus, A., 2019. Ants in isolation: obstacles to testing responses to task stimuli outside of the colony context. *Insectes Soc* 66, 343–354.

Lewis, W.J., Takasu, K., 1990. Use of learned odours by a parasitic wasp in accordance with host and food needs. *Nature* 348, 635–636.

Lihoreau, M., Brepson, L., Rivault, C., 2009. The weight of the clan: even in insects, social isolation can induce a behavioural syndrome. *Behav Proc* 82, 81–84. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.beproc.2009.03.008>

Lihoreau, M., Chittka, L., Raine, N.E., 2016a. Monitoring flower visitation networks and interactions between pairs of bumble bees in a large outdoor flight cage. *PLoS One* 11, e0150844.

Lihoreau, M., Chittka, L., Raine, N.E., 2010. Travel optimization by foraging bumblebees through re-adjustments of traplines after discovery of new feeding locations. *Am Nat* 176, 744–757. <https://doi.org/10.1086/657042>

Lihoreau, M., Latty, T., Chittka, L., 2012a. An exploration of the social brain hypothesis in insects. *Front Physiol* 3. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fphys.2012.00442>

Lihoreau, M., Raine, N.E., Reynolds, A.M., Stelzer, R.J., Lim, K.S., Smith, A.D., Osborne, J.L., Chittka, L., 2013. Unravelling the mechanisms of trapline foraging in bees. *Comm Integr*

742 Biol 6, e22701. <https://doi.org/10.4161/cib.22701>
 743 Lihoreau, M., Raine, N.E., Reynolds, A.M., Stelzer, R.J., Lim, K.S., Smith, A.D., Osborne,
 744 J.L., Chittka, L., 2012b. Radar tracking and motion-sensitive cameras on flowers reveal the
 745 development of pollinator multi-destination routes over large spatial scales. *PLoS Biol* 10,
 746 e100139. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.1001392>
 747 Lihoreau, M., Rivault, C., 2008. Tactile stimuli trigger group effect in cockroach
 748 aggregations. *Anim Behav* 75, 1965–1972. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2007.12.006>
 749 Lihoreau, M., Rivault, C., van Zweden, J.S., 2016b. Kin discrimination increases with odour
 750 distance in the German cockroach. *Behav Ecol* 6, 1694–1701.
 751 Lihoreau, M., Zimmer, C., Rivaut, C., 2007. Kin recognition and incest avoidance in a group-
 752 living insect. *Behav Ecol* 18, 880–887. <https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/arm046>
 753 Loukola, O.J., Perry, C.J., Coscos, L., Chittka, L., 2017. Bumblebees show cognitive
 754 flexibility by improving on an observer complex behavior. *Science* 355, 833–836.
 755 Marescotti, M., Lagogiannis, K., Webb, B., Davies, R.W., Armstrong, J.D., 2018. Monitoring
 756 brain activity and behaviour in freely moving *Drosophila* larvae using bioluminescence. *Sci*
 757 *Rep* 8, 9246.
 758 Margulies, C., Tully, T., Dubnau, J., 2006. Deconstructing memory in *Drosophila*. *Curr Biol*
 759 15, R700–R713.
 760 Meikle, W.G., Holst, N., 2015. Application of continuous monitoring of honeybee colonies.
 761 *Apidologie* 46, 10–22.
 762 Menzel, R., 2012. The honeybee as a model for understanding the basis of cognition. *Nat Rev*
 763 *Neurosci* 13, 758–768. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1038/nm3357>
 764 Mery, F., Belay, A.T., So, A.K.T., Sokolowski, M.B., Kawecki, T.J., 2007. Natural
 765 polymorphism affecting learning and memory in *Drosophila*. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA*
 766 13051–13055.
 767 Morand-Ferron, J., Cole, E.F., Quinn, J.L., 2015. Studying the evolutionary ecology of
 768 cognition in the wild: a review of practical and conceptual challenges. *Biol Rev* 91, 367–389.
 769 Muth, F., Cooper, T.R., Bonilla, R.F., Leonard, A.S., 2018. A novel protocol for studying bee
 770 cognition in the wild. *Methods Ecol Evol* 9, 78–87.
 771 Niggebrügge, C., Lebouille, G., Menzel, R., Komischke, B., de Ibarra, N.H., 2009. Fast
 772 learning but coarse discrimination of colours in restrained honeybees. *J Exp Biol* 212, 1344–
 773 1350.
 774 O'Donnell, S.O., Bulova, S.J., DeLeon, S., Khodak, P., Miller, S., Sulger, E., 2015.
 775 Distributed cognition and social brains: reductions in mushroom body investment
 776 accompanied the origins of sociality in wasps (Hymenoptera: Vespidae). *Proc R Soc B* 282,
 777 20150791.
 778 Ofstad, T.A., Zuker, C.S., Reiser, M.B., 2011. Visual place learning in *Drosophila*
 779 *melanogaster*. *Nature* 474, 204–207. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature10131>
 780 Ohashi, K., D'Souza, D., Thomson, J.D., 2010. An automated system for tracking and
 781 identifying individual nectar foragers at multiple feeders. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* 64, 891–897.
 782 Ohashi, K., Leslie, A., Thomson, J.D., 2008. Trapline foraging by bumble bees. V. Effects of
 783 experience and priority on competitive performance. *Behav Ecol* 19, 936–948.
 784 <https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/arn048>
 785 Ohashi, K., Thomson, J.D., D'Souza, D., 2007. Trapline foraging by bumble bees: IV.
 786 Optimization of route geometry in the absence of competition. *Behav Ecol* 18, 1–11.
 787 <https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/arl053>
 788 Oswald, D., Waddell, S., 2015. Olfactory learning skews mushroom body output pathways to
 789 steer behavioral choice in *Drosophila*. *Curr Opin Neurobiol* 35, 178–184.
 790 Papaj, D.R., Lewis, A.C., 2012. *Insect Learning: Ecological and Evolutionary Perspectives*,
 791 Springer Science + Business Media Dordrecht. ed.

792 Pasquaretta, C., Jeanson, R., Pasanel, J., Raine, N.E., Chittka, L., Lihoreau, M., 2019. A
 793 spatial network analysis of resource partitioning between bumblebees foraging on artificial
 794 flowers in a flight cage. *Movement Ecology* 7, 4.
 795 Pavlou, H.J., Goodwin, S.F., 2013. Courtship behavior in *Drosophila melanogaster*: towards a
 796 ‘courtship connectome.’ *Curr Opin Neurobiol* 23, 76–83.
 797 Pérez-Escudero, A., Vicente-Page, J., Hinz, R.C., Arganda, S., de Polavieja, G.G., 2014.
 798 idTracker: tracking individuals in a group by automatic identification of unmarked animals.
 799 *Nat Meth* 11, 743–748. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.2994>
 800 Perry, C.J., Baciadonna, L., Chittka, L., 2016. Unexpected rewards induce dopamine-
 801 dependent positive emotion-like state changes in bumblebees. *Science* 353, 1529–1531.
 802 Perry, C.J., Barron, A.B., 2013. Honey bees selectively avoid difficult choices. *Proc. Natl.*
 803 *Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 110, 19155–19159.
 804 Perry, C.J., Barron, A.B., Chittka, L., 2017. The frontiers of insect cognition. *Curr Opin*
 805 *Behav Sci* 16, 111–118.
 806 Pritchard, D.J., Hurly, T.A., Tello-Ramos, M.C., Healy, S.D., 2016. Why study cognition in
 807 the wild (and how to test it)? *J Exp Anal Behav* 105, 41–55.
 808 Ramdya, P., Lichocki, P., Cruchet, S., Frisch, L., Tse, W., Floreano, D., Benton, R., 2014.
 809 Mechanosensory interactions drive collective behaviour in *Drosophila*. *Nature* 519, 233–6.
 810 <https://doi.org/doi:10.1038/nature14024>
 811 Riley, J.R., Smith, A.D., Reynolds, D.R., Edwards, A.S., Osborne, J.L., Williams, I.H.,
 812 Carreck, N.L., Poppy, G.M., 1996. Tracking bees with harmonic radar. *Nature* 379, 29–30.
 813 <https://doi.org/10.1038/379029b0>
 814 Rivault, C., Cloarec, A., 1998. Cockroach aggregation: discrimination between strain odours
 815 in *Blattella germanica*. *Anim Behav* 55, 177–184. <https://doi.org/10.1006/anbe.1997.0628>
 816 Rivault, C., Cloarec, A., Sreng, L., 1998. Cuticular extracts inducing aggregation in the
 817 German cockroach, *Blattella germanica* (L.). *J Insect Physiol* 44, 909–918.
 818 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1910\(98\)00062-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1910(98)00062-6)
 819 Riveros, A.J., Seid, M.A., Wcislo, W.T., 2012. Evolution of brain size in class-based societies
 820 of fungus-growing ants (*Attini*). *Anim Behav* 83, 1043–1049.
 821 Saleh, N., Chittka, L., 2007. Traplining in bumblebees (*Bombus terrestris*): a foraging
 822 strategy’s ontogeny and the importance of spatial reference memory in short-range foraging.
 823 *Oecologia* 151, 719–730. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-006-0607-9>
 824 Sasaki, M., Pratt, S.C., 2012. Groups have a larger cognitive capacity than individuals. *Curr*
 825 *Biol* 22, R827–R829. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2012.07.058>
 826 Sasaki, T., Granovsky, B., Mann, R., Sumpter, D.J.T., Pratt, S.C., 2013. Ant colonies
 827 outperform individuals when a sensory discrimination task is difficult but not when it is easy.
 828 *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 110, 13769–13773.
 829 Sasaki, T., Pratt, S.C., 2011. Emergence of group rationality from irrational individuals.
 830 *Behav Ecol* 22, 276–281.
 831 Scheiner, R., Sokolowski, M.B., Erber, J., 2004. Activity of cGMP-dependent protein kinase
 832 (PKG) affects sucrose responsiveness and habituation in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Learn*
 833 *Mem* 11, 303–311.
 834 Seeley, T.D., 2010. Honeybee democracy. Princeton University Press.
 835 Sheehan, M.J., Tibbetts, E.A., 2016. Specialized face learning is associated with individual
 836 recognition in paper wasps. *Science* 334, 1272–1275.
 837 Sheehan, M.J., Tibbetts, E.A., 2011. Specialized face learning is associated with individual
 838 recognition in paper wasps. *Science* 334, 1272–1275.
 839 Sheehan, M.J., Tibbetts, E.A., 2008. Robust long-term social memories in a paper wasp. *Curr*
 840 *Biol* 18, R851–852.
 841 Shettleworth, S.J., 2009. Cognition, evolution and behavior, Second Edition. ed. Oxford

University Press, New York, NY.

Simpson, S.J., Sword, G.A., Lorch, P.D., Couzin, I.D., 2006. Cannibal crickets on a forced march for protein and salt. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 103, 4152–4156. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0508915103>

Smid, H.M., Wang, G., Bukovinszky, T., Steidle, J.L.M., Bleeker, M.A.K., van Loon, J.J.A., Vet, L.E.M., 2007. Species-specific acquisition and consolidation of long-term memory in parasitic wasps. *Proc R Soc B* 274, 1539–1546. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2007.0305>

Sokolowski, M.B., 2010. Social interactions in “simple” model systems. *Neuron* 65, 780–794.

Sokolowski, M.B., 1980. Foraging strategies of *Drosophila melanogaster*: a chromosomal analysis. *Behav Genet* 10, 291–301.

Sovik, E., Plath, J.A., Devaud, J.M., Barron, A.B., 2016. Neuropharmacological manipulation of restrained and free-flying honey bees, *Apis mellifera*. *JoVE* 117, e54695. <https://doi.org/10.3791/54695>

Stanley, D.A., Smith, K.E., Raine, N.E., 2015. Bumblebee learning and memory is impaired by chronic exposure to a neonicotinoid pesticide. *Sci Rep* 5, 16508.

Stork, N.E., 2018. How many species of insects and other terrestrial arthropods are there on Earth? *Annu Rev Entomol* 63, 31–45.

Stowers, J.R., Hofbauer, M., Bastien, R., Griessner, J., Higgins, P., Farooqui, S., Fischer, R.M., Nowikovskiy, K., Haubensak, W., Couzin, I.D., Tessmar-Raible, K., Straw, A.D., 2017. Virtual reality for freely moving animals. *Nature Methods* 14, 995–1002.

Strausfeld, N.J., 2012. *Arthropod Brains: Evolution, Functional Elegance, and Historical Significance*, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. ed. Cambridge, MA.

Stroeymeyt, N., Grasse, A.V., Crespi, A., Mersch, D.P., Cremer, S., Keller, L., 2018. Social network plasticity decreases disease transmission in a eusocial insect. *Science* 362, 941–945.

Sword, G.A., Lorch, P.D., Gwynne, D.T., 2005. Migratory bands give crickets protection. *Nature* 433.

Takeda, K., 1961. Classical conditioned response in the honey bee. *J Insect Physiol* 6, 168–179.

Thomson, J.D., 1996. Trapline foraging by bumblebees: I. Persistence of flight-path geometry. *Behav. Ecol.* 7, 158–164.

Thomson, J.D., Slatkin, M., Thomson, A., 1997. Trapline foraging by bumble bees: II. Definition and detection from sequence data. *Behav Ecol* 8, 199–210. <https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/8.2.199>

Tinbergen, N., 1932. Über die Orientierung des Bienenwolfes (*Philanthus triangulum* Fabr.). *Z. Vergl. Physiol.* 16, 305–334.

Tsvetkov, N., Cook, C.N., Zayed, A., 2019. Effects of group size on learning and memory in the honey bee *Apis mellifera*. *J Exp Biol* 222, jeb193888.

Uzsak, A., Schal, C., 2013. Social interaction facilitates reproduction in male German cockroaches, *Blattella germanica*. *Animal Behaviour* 85, 1501–1509.

van Zweden, J.S., D’Ettorre, P., 2010. Nestmate recognition in social insects and the role of hydrocarbons, in: *Insect Hydrocarbons: Biology, Biochemistry and Chemical Ecology*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, pp. 222–243.

von Frisch, K., 1967. *The dance language and orientation of bees*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

von Frisch, K., 1915. Der Farbensinn und Formensinn der Bienen. *Zool Jb Physiol* 35, 1–188.

Wilson, E.O., 1971. *The Insect Societies*. Belknap Press, Cambridge, MA.

Woodgate, J.L., Makinson, J.C., Lim, K.S., Reynolds, A.M., Chittka, L., 2017. Continuous radar tracking illustrates the development of multi-destination routes of bumblebees. *Sci Rep* 7, 17323.

Worden, B.D., Papaj, D.R., 2005. Flower choice copying in bumblebees. *Biol Lett* 1, 504–

507. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2005.0368>

Wystrach, A., Schwartz, S., 2013. Ants use a predictive mechanism to compensate for passive displacements by wind. *Curr Biol* 23, R1083–R1085.

Yang, Z., Bertolucci, F., Wolf, R., Heisenberg, M., 2013. Flies cope with uncontrollable stress by learned helplessness. *Curr Biol* 23, 799–803.

Zheng, Z., Lauritzen, J.S., Perlman, E., Robinson, C.G., Nichols, M., Milkie, D., Torrens, O., Price, J., Fisher, C.B., Sharifi, N., Calle-Schuler, S.A., Kmecova, L., Ali, I.J., Karsh, B., Trautman, E.T., Bogovic, J.A., Hanslovsky, P., Jefferis, G.S.X.E., Kashdan, M., Khairy, K., Saalfeld, S., Fetter, R.D., Bock, D.D., 2018. A complete electron microscopy volume of the brain of adult *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Cell* 174, 730–743.